REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending. By this Response, claims 1, 11 and 15 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the indication of claims 2 and 12 as containing allowable subject matter.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 7 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kurogi, et al. (U.S. Patent Appln. No. 2002/0008474 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kurogi teaches a plasma display panel made up of various arrangements of electrodes. Although various shapes of electrodes are taught, the overall design and operation remain the same in Kurogi. The Office Action references Fig. 9 of Kurogi as providing the features of applicants' independent claims 1 and 15. Fig. 9 of Kurogi discloses electrodes 417, a metal film 42d that traverses the base of the electrodes and barrier ribs 29d which are long rectangular strips that separate the electrodes into columns. Applicants respectfully submit that the elongated barrier ribs of Kurogi are not the same as the claimed barrier structure of applicants' independent claims 1 and 15.

The barrier structure of claims 1 and 15 are recited as "a barrier structure, the inner surfaces of which being disposed along the outer ends of the plurality of display element electrode thereby defining the outer shape of a plurality of cells which narrows continuously in a direction away from the linear edges toward the

bus electrode". The barrier structure of claims 1 and 15 are provided on the outer edges of each cell. Thus, the shape of the cell is defined by the barrier structure. The barrier structure is not elongated rectangular ribs that are located adjacent to the electrodes and used to separate columns, as taught in Kurogi. Furthermore, the long rectangular ribs of Kurogi do not narrow continuously, let alone in a direction away from the linear edges toward the bus electrode, as claimed.

The barrier structure in the present invention is coated in a phosphor member which causes luminescence in response to a discharge of the display element electrodes. Thus, the specific arrangement of the barrier structure of the present invention by defining the cells containing electrodes, enhances the emitted light. This is an improvement upon the general barrier rib system, taught in Kurogi and the prior art. Thus, Kurogi fails to teach each and every aspect of the claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Komaki, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,160) in view of Kurogi et al.; claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurogi et al, in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 5,124,615); claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurogi in view of Shinoda, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,661,500); claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurogi, et al. in view of Shinoda, et al and Mizobata (U.S. Patent Appln. Publication 2002/0063526) and claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurogi, et al. in view of

Okumura, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,100,633). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action alleges that Komaki teaches each of the recited features of claim 1 except for the narrowing continuously of the width of the electrodes. The Office Action alleges that Kurogi provides the deficient features of Komaki and that the combination provides applicants' invention recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Kurogi teaches a plasma display panel having electrodes in a "T" shape. The electrodes are flanked by elongated rectangular ribs 12 on each side which define columns for the electrodes. Studs 9 which are made of the same material as the ribs 12 are circular patterns located at the base of the "T" electrodes. See Fig. 1.

Similarly, Kurogi teaches the use of barrier ribs (as discussed above) that are provided in elongated rectangular strips on either side of the electrodes. Thus, both Komaki and Kurogi teach very similar barrier rib structures.

Both Komaki and Kurogi fail to teach the claimed barrier structure of the present invention. The barrier structure of the present invention defines the outer shape of the cells containing the electrodes. See, for example Fig. 6(a), element 29 of the present invention. The combination of Komaki and Kurogi at best teach elongated rectangular strips of barrier ribs with the addition of circular studs at the base of an electrode. Thus, the combination of Komaki and Kurogi fail to teach or suggest a barrier structure, the inner surfaces of which being disposed

among the outer ends of the plurality of display element electrodes thereby defining the outer shape of a plurality of cells, as recited in claim 1.

Further, Kim, Shinoda, Mizobata and Okumura fail to make up for the deficiencies of Komaki and Kurogi. Accordingly, in view of the above, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

The Office Action rejections claims 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nunomura (U.S. Patent No. 6,479,932) in view of Mizobata and claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nunomura in view of Mizobata and Okumura. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action alleges that Nunomura teaches each of the claimed features except for the claimed dielectric layer. The Office Action alleges that Mizobata provides the dielectric layer and when combined with Nunomura provides applicants' claimed invention. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The claimed barrier structure of the present invention is not taught by Nunomura or Mizobata. Nunomura teaches the use of partition walls 17 which are elongated strips located adjacent to the electrodes. Mizobata teaches ribs 17 which are also strips located adjacent to the electrodes. Neither the partition set wall nor the ribs are disposed along the outer edges of the electrode and thereby defines the outer shape of the plurality of cells, as recited in claim 11.

Also, the use of a dielectric layer in Mizobata is designed for the specific characteristics of the Mizobata plasma electrodes. The characteristic associated

with various devices when utilizing semiconductor materials and technology, can be dramatically altered by minor changes to the design and addition or removal of various materials. The system of Mizobata is designed to utilize dielectric material, while the system of Nunomura does not teach the use of dielectric materials in the manner of Mizobata.

The Office Action refers to paragraph 44 of Mizobata for providing the motivation to combine Mizobata's teachings with Nunomura. This section of text, however, merely discusses the measurements associated with Mizobata's design using dielectric material. It is does not assert that such materials and design can be universally implemented into other plasma electrode designs. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Nunomura and Mizobata fail to teach or suggest the barrier structure and dielectric layer as recited in claim 11.

Further, Okumura fails to make up for the deficiency of Nunomura and Mizobata. Accordingly, in view of the above, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3-11 and 13-15 are distinguishable over the cited references. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings (Reg. No. 48,917) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

#40,439

By _____
Michael R. Cammarata, #39,491

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

MRC/CJB:cb
0925-0167P

Attachment(s)